EDITOR'S NOTE

THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE POOR HARD COPY AT THE TIME OF FILMING. IF AND WHEN A BETTER COPY CAN BE OBTAINED, A NEW FICHE WILL BE ISSUED.

91-1008

NO:

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1992

JOE L. ROBINSON,
Petitioner

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al,
Respondents

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

PETITION FOR CERTIORARI

JOE L. ROBINSON
5208 Whaley Drive
Dayton, Ohio 45427
513) 854-2789

QUESTIONED PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Whether or not a U.S. Magistrate be allowed to file motions in the Court of Appeals for the Defendants Attorney who stated he is not admitted to practice for the Sixth Circuit. Should any of the motions habe been granted.

2. Whether or not Federal Rule 12 (b) (6) is appropriate for dismissal by the Defendants when Petitioner had already file Federal Rule 57 Declaratory Judgment; in pertinent parts;...relief in cases where it is appropriate...right to trial by jury...& other remedies.

3. Whether or not the District Court is practicing racial discrimination against Petitioner & other blacks with the jury list by allowing all white jurors on cases against them,

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW CONTINUED-

would this be consider a Constitution violation or would this be a direct action to discriminate by the District Court, Should the U.S. Government, et al, be liable for this action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Acts .

4. Whether or not an Appeal Court can rule against his prior rulings which ruling is valid in Judicial Imminuty, would this ruling be part of Rule 17 (a) which states, a Writ of Certorari would be only granted when there is a special and important reason , when a Federal Court of Appeals have render a decision which conflicts with another Federal Court of Appeals in the same manner.

5. Whether or not there are two sets

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW CONTINUED-

of laws; when a black Justice denies charges without proof, except for words and states this is wrong, immoral and a form of lynching or a white District Judge deprive blacks of their constitution rights than use I've got Judicial immunity, is there two separate set of laws.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Table of Citations continued--

Cases	Pages
Powers v. Ohio 89-5011	3
Pullian v. Allen 466 U.S. 522 (1985)	24
Robinson v. Daugherty, et al 85-3569	19,22
Robinson v. Local 696 U.A.W. 88-3655	4
Robinson v. Quick, et al 89-105	4,17
Robinson v. U.S. Government, et al 91-3300	8, 22
Screws v. U.S.A. 325 U.S. 91 (1945)	12
Swain v. Ala. 380 U.S. 233	7,24
OTHERS	
Fed. Rule, 12(b)(6)	15,16
Fed App. R. 34	16
Fed. Rule 37,38 &57	8
28 U.S.C. Sec. 636(b)(2) R. 53	
42 U.S.C. 1981	26
42 U.S.C. 1983	21
42 U.S.C. 1985	21, 26
1st & 14th Amendments	15

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the United States Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals is reported at Robinson v. United States of America, et al, 91-3300. The opinion of the U. S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio western Division is reported at Robinson v. United States of America, et al, C-1-90-0026, 1990.

JURISDICTION

The Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals was entered on September 26, 1991, see Robinson v. U. S. Government, et al, Appendix A. This petition for Certiorari to the Supreme Court is filed within ninety (90) days of the Judgment below. The Statutes under which the Appeal to this court is 28 U.S.C. 1254 (1) (3).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The First Amendment of the Constitution provides;

Congress shall make no law adbridging the freedom of speech or the right of the people to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution provides in pertinent parts;

All persons born or naturalized in the U.S.A. and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the U.S.A. ...no state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the U.S.A.; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner filed a complaint against the U.S. Government, et al, for Tort; Federal Rule 2674 ; Liability of U.S.A. for violation of the Constitution and Conspiracy in 1989 after the Supreme Court had ruled that blacks may have members of their own race as jurors, Swain v. Ala., 380 U.S. 233, Ford v. Georgia, 87-6796, & Powers v. Ohio, 89-5011.

On February 2, 1991, the District Court dismissed the complaint citing Fed. Rule 12 (b) (6) failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. On 3-20-1991 Petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal paupier. On 9-26-91, The Sixth Circuit affirmed the District Court dismissal.

In 1984, Petitioner filed a complaint againsttwo of his supervisors for harrassment & racial discrimination due to his 1974 injuries, Robinson v. Quick

et al, 88-3298 & later amended his employer, Delco Moraine G.M.C. because of further actions from higher staff and other members of his employer.

In 1986, Petitioner sued his Union for racial discrimination & retialiation Robinson v. Local 696 U.A.W.,88-3655 for failure to represent him.

As a result of the case against Delco Moraine, the Title VII was dismissed, the case went to trial with an all white jury (which was not denied but confirmed by the Defendant and the District Court, an all white jury picked from an all white communities) the verdict was not guilty against the Defendant.

The complaint against Petitioner Union was dismissed, however, the District Court & Court of Appeals noted there was some forms of discrimination & retialiation. The Defendant presented two false affivadits from two members, one of them Mark Dobson had testified in

court & given different testimony to the contract violation by Delco Moraine, neither of these individuals were the shop committeeman. The shop committeeman, Ken Hawkey testified to contract violation by Delco Moraine. There was other witness -ess who testified to racial discrimination by Delco Moraine against petitioner & other employees who are black. One of the black female supervisor test- ified to racial discrimination & sex- ual harrassment against her. After appx- romiate thirty witnesses testified to contract violation and racial discri- mination, the all white jury still brought in a verdict of not guilty.

ARGUMENT TO WHY PETITIONER SHOULD BE GRANTED WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

In checking the record of the District Court by Plaintiff, a pro se, there had been four other cases in this

area black lawyers with black clients against white Defendants, some against General Motors Corporation. One of the Defendants was a black doctor who was represented by a black attorney firm, he was convicted by an all white jury.

The District Judge ruling was Plaintiff was a pro se and did not handle his case right in not being familiar with the jury vior dire selections, however, the jury list included nine whites to one black who was staggered so the blacks if picked could be dismissed without questioning. Petitioner states if he was so unfamiliar with the jury selection why would the black lawyers get treated the same & end up with an all white jury & loose their cases see McAlpine v. Truck & Bus GMC, 3-C.V. 85-000, their Title VII was thrown out, a black lawyer with a black client; Dr. Boutiquett, CR-3-861, a black lawyer, a

black doctor and an all white jury. Dr. Boutiquett was convicted, served time in prison even after hiring three other black law firms; House of Wheat v. Miami Broadcasting, 82-293, 82-922, Plaintiff black Defendants white, an all white jury, case dismissed.

In 1989, when Petitioner filed his complaint he stressed this type of action against himself and other blacks in the area after a ruling by the Supreme Court in a criminal case where the Defendant had an all white jury & was convicted, the Supreme Court reverse & remanded the case, Ford v. Georgia, Ibid, Swain v. Ala Ibid, states negroes has a right to have members of their own race as jurors.

Petitioner complaint was dismissed on Fed. Rule 12 (b) (6) failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, although he had file Fed. Rule 57, Dec.-laratory Judgment which could & would have given him relief including trial

by jury Fed. Rule 38, 39, the same when Petitioner filed a complaint against his Union, who failed to resent him. Pet.-itioner asked for a jury trial with a mixed jury this case was dismissed using false affivadits. Writ of Certiorari should be granted according to Supreme Court 17 (a) in pertinent parts; when a Federal Court of Appeals has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceeding*. Peti-tioner states by dismissing his case with false false affivadits is a departure from usual judicial proceedings.

In this complaint Robinson v. U.S. Government, et al, 91-3300 he asked for a jury trial & asked that this case be transferred to Washington, D. C. where there was more blacks to pick from since his other case and the other four blacks could not get blacks as jurors, his request was denied.

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the District Court decision & stated, "when Robinson's complaint is construed in the light most favorable to him and all of his factial allegations are accepted as true, he can prove no set of facts in support of his claims that would entitle him to relief". They confirmed the fact that Petitioner did asked that this case be removed to D. C., they confirmed the fact that Petitioner asked for an attorney to represent him with his complaint, they confirmed the fact that Petitioner asked his complaint to be mailed to every member of congress at the government expense, they confirmed the fact that Petitioner did asked for black jurors, they confirmed the fact that Petitioner stated that District Judges should not have Judicial Immunity when presiding over this trial and the action was not

judicial. When Petitioner filed his complaint, he sent copies of it to members of Congress & to the Prosecutor office in D. C. He asked each person to stop putting in office bias and racial judges. He asked for help in changing the way the law is in civil rights cases dealing with Title VII & racial discrimination for fear of the Court denying him certain rights; such as, he fear they would not send his complaint to congress, & he wouldn't get a fair trial, because of the way the court treated him before. He sent the complaint. This was true because of the District Court dismissing the case without a jury trial, the Court of Appeals affirmed the dismissal stating Petitioner could not prove a set of facts.

On 11-21-91, President Bush signed the Civil Rights Bill #S 1745. He affirmed the Title VII of the C.R.A. & stated changes be brought against those

employers who discriminate. Petitioner is asking the Government for a copy of that signed bill to familiar himself before he sends his reply brief. This complaint was asked by the Defendant for a motion to dismissed on 1-23-90, he used Rule 12 (b) (6) of F.R.C.P. & Judicial Immunity & stated clearly "it must failed as a result of Judicial immunity", he cited, "Block, Stump v. Sparkman & the History of Judicial Immunity, 1980 Duke L.J. 879". He stated that, "judicial immunity had never been denied" & that it was clear that all "wrongs" complained by Plaintiff boils down to the acts and decisions of the District Court in its judicial capacity for which no cause of action may lie.

On 2-10-90, Petitioner filed a motion for Declaratory Judgment & Relief charging the Defendants with racial discrimination, Daniel v. Board of Ed.

of Ravenna School Dist., 805 F .2d 203 207 (6th cir. 1986) Petitioner states that his constitution rights was violated. Petitioner states that Writ of Certiorari should be granted to him according to Supreme Court Rule 17 (c) in pertinent parts..when a Federal Court of Appeals had decided a Federal Question in a way in conflict with applicable decision of this court. Petitioner states that Judges was not exempted from judicial immunity in Picking v. Pennsylvania R. R., 151 F .2d 240 (1945) (3rd. Cir.) which states judicial immunity was not avialable in action against judges under what is now Section 1983. In Screws v. U.S.A.,325 U.S. 91 (1945) Justice Douglass stated,"it is necessary to exempt judges from liability for the consquences of their honest mistakes, but it is far different from saying that a judge should be immune from the

consquences of any of his judicial actions and that he shall be liable for the knowing and intentional deprivation of a person's civil rights'. Petitioner recited Stumps v. Sparkman, Ibid, Stumps actions were not judicial and hence that judicial immunity did not protect those actions....whether an act is judicial depends on the character of the act. Ibid 916. In Harris v. Harvey, 605 .F 12d 330 (7th Cir. 1979) 445 U.S. 938 (1980), concerns a 1983 action by a black police officer against a state judge. The Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit denied the Judge's defense of judicial immunity on the grounds that "Judge Harvey's attacks on Plaintiff were not part of his duties Id. 337.

Petitioner filed his complaint against his former employer, Delco Moraine & went to court after four other cases had been filed by blacks in the

area, McAlpine v. Truck & Bus, Ibid, & others mention before. These cases had already had all white jurors & lost. Judge Rice was aware of this because most of the cases was in the District Court & was heard by him or his staff. When the all white jury was picked from the jury list that was drawn from apredominantly all white area Judge Rice was aware of it, because he had a copy of the jury list. After the verdict by the all white jury, Pettiioner pointed this out to Judge Rice within two days of the biased jury toward blacks.

In Petitioner second complaint against his Union he asked for a mixed jury for this trial, the same as He pointed out in his complaint against the U.S. Government, et al, he asked for a mixed jury. In the case against his Union, the case was dismissed using false affivadits by the Defendants

which was not denied. Petitoner feels that this was not part of Judge Rice's duty, this was not a judicial act but was a knowing and intentional deprivation of his civil & constitutional rights. The Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution provides in pertinent parts...No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the U.S.A. ..nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. In Stumps, Judge Stumps actions was not judicial & judicial immunity does not protect those actions. Petitioner states the same thing applies to Judge Rice.

In Petitioner complaint against The Government, et al, the Defendant answer was Petitioner failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted Fed. R. 12 (b) (6) & judicial immunity.

Magistrate Jack Sherman who preside over the case denied the dismissal on those grounds on 3-15-90, he stated, "after a full and fair reading of Defendant's motion, this court concludes that Defendants have failed to support their factual assertions with legal authority." Defendants was order to submit other authority.

On 4-30-90, Defendants filed a Supplemental memorandum in support of motion to dismiss reusing the same motion Fed. Rule 12 (b) (6) & Judicial Immunity, & requested that oral argument not be heard.

On 8-26-91, The Court of Appeals dismissed the complaint & stated, "this case has been referred to a panel of the court pursuit 9 (a) rules of the 6th Circuit upon examination the panel unanimously agreed that oral argument is not necessary Fed. R. App. P. 34 (a)"

Petitioner states this panel granted Gary G. Lockhart motion not to hear oral argument after he had admitted he was not allowed to practice to the Bar of the 6th Circuit. The record will show the courts granted every motion the Defendants asked for, the record will show they granted only one motion for Petitioner & that was to enlarge. When Petitioner filed his Notice of Appeal, he filed paupier as the record will show, due to the fact he had been off from work since 8-5-85, for the following reasons; he was injured on the job on 2-12-74, which was affirmed by his union & employer, Robinson v. Quick et al, 89-105, he had surgery twice form the same injuries in 1983 which left him partial paralyzed and in pain. In 1985, he was fired from his employer form his injuries and racial discrimination. When he filed his notice of appeal paupier, he stated

he had filed for his social security #426-72-0913 but had not received it, if and when he did he would pay the fee. Majestrate Sherman filed a motion with the Sixth Circuit objecting to Petitioner filing paupier with knowledge of his financial problem, he also filed other motions for the Defendants includung motion to dismiss stating (120 days Plaintiff not serve the Defendants copy of the complaint, 300 days Defendants was not serve). However before the Court granted the motion, Petitioner was granted his social security, they stated that Robinson had met all of the requirements of the Social Security Act. They further stated the record will show Robinson disability came from his injuries from his job in 1974 at Delco Moraine & had been unable to do any type of work for almost six years. A copy of this decision was sent to the

Sixth Circuit by Petitioner.

The Court of Appeals further stated, "when Robinson's complaint is construed in thelight most favorable to him and all of his factual allegations are accepted as true he can prove no set of facts in support of his claims that would entitle him to relief". In their dismissal they affirmed the fact that a Federal Judge has judicial immunity, however, in Robinson v. Daugherty, et al, 85-3569, they affirmed the fact that on 2-12-74, Petitioner sustained an injury which he filed a worker's compensation in Montgomerty county common pleas court where his all white attorney failed to prosecute, the case was dismissed. This case was appeal to the Sixth Circuit, who stated, "it is elementary that "state action" must exist to support a claim under 42 U.S.C. 1985, Flagg Bros Inc. v. Brooks, 436 U.S. 149 155 (1978)".

Petitioner had filed a complaint in the county court after he had exhausted his appeal with Bureau of Worker's Compensation, his employer failed to answer timelywise, he filed a motion for judgment, the court agreeded that the employer failed to answer and stated Petitioner could not defend himself and ordered him to get an attorney to settle the case. The court stated he did not want Petitioner to state later he was deprive of his rights. The white attorney lost the case, he failed to prosecute. Petitioner appeal his case to the Court of Appeals of Montgomery County Common Pleas Court who stated, they could not find a dismissal after searching the record therefore, Petitioner had nothing to appeal from. Petitoner filed his case in the District Court for violation of the Constitution and his civil & equal rights. The court dismissed the

case stating Petitioner failed to prosecute. Petitioner appeal this case to the Sixth Circuit who dismissed the appeal stating had the Petitioner filed his complaint against the white attorney and white Judge there would not have been no judicial immunity under 42 U.S.C. 1983, Flagg Bros v. Brooks, Ibid, "It is true that a private individual who conspires with a state official to deprive a citizen of his constitutional rights maybe held accountable under Section 1983, Martin Mariettav. Bendix Corp., 690 F .2d 558 (6th Cir. 1982)."

42 U.S.C. 1985, conspiracy to interfere with civil rights in pertinent parts, if two or more persons conspire for the purpose of impeding, hindering, obstructing, or defeating, in any manner, the due course of justice in any State or Territory, with intent to deny to any citizen the equal protection of the laws...

Petitioner states he should be granted Writ of Certiorari according to Supreme Court Rule 17 (c) in pertinent parts; When a Federal Court of Appeals has decided an important question of Federal law which has not been, but should be settled by this court. Petitioner states the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals made two separate decisons concerning the same circumstances, Robinson v. Daugherty et al, 85-2117, they stated a judge could be held liable and there would be no judicial immunity under 42 U.S.C. 1983 for conspiracy & discrimination, Robinson v. U.S. Government, et al, Ibid, they stated Judges have judicial immunity, these are like circumstances

CONCLUSION

The Appeals court stated in Robinson v. U.S. Government et al, 91-3300 that a Federal Judge has judicial immunity. In another dismissal Robinson v. Daugherty et al, ibid, the same Appeal court stated Judges don't have judicial under 42 U.S.C. 1983. Petitioner should be granted Writ of Certiorari under Supreme Court Rule 17 which states a Certiorari will only be granted when thereare Special reasons; a conflict between the Federal Court of Appeals, a resolution of a conflict of a state court; departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings and when a Federal Court of Appeals had decided a Federal question in a way in conflict with applicable decision of this Court.

Petition states it is plain to see

the Court of Appeals uses a different dismissal when they dismiss Petitioner complaints. He feels this is because he is black which is a direct violation of his civil rights.

Judge Rice stated in Booker v. Riley, 89-1779, using Pullian v. Allen, 466 U.S. 522 (1985) that judges do not have judicial immunity when he dismissed a case with a black plaintiff and a white Defendant. The record will show there is a conspiracy in the District Court to dismiss all cases filed by or against blacks involving racial discrimination. Concerning the other four blacks Plaintiffs with black lawyers case was dismissed. The critical point is Dr. Boutquette complaint was criminal with a very high attorneys fees. He used three law firms but was still convicted with a lot of time and did served time in prison, they

also took his license. There was a white doctor in the area with similar charges who complaint got thrown out on techniciality, he used a white law firm. As quoted by Justice Thomas, blacks are being lynch by our own judicial system and this type of action should be dealt harshly and double penalty put against those for discrimination. President Bush, who recommended Clarence Thomas, stated; there is no place in our judicial system for intentional discrimination and that he would sign the civil rights Bill.

Petitioner is asking and praying for all benefits the law allows and that insurance for he and his family be reinstated and that this be paid for by the U.S. Government et al, as he stated in his original complaint on the facts that Judge Rice discriminated

against him and other blacks, 42 U.S.C. 1981, and conspired with attorneys 42 U.S.C. 42 1985, conspiracy to interfere with civil rights. Judge Rice dismissed the complaint against Petitioner Union knowing the affivadits was false which was not denied.

In Robinson v. Quick, et al, it was stated by the Defendants that a meeting was held by the Company to identify a job for Mr. Robinson to perform, no union official attended this meeting nor did they put input into it.

Petitioner states the only defense the District Court offered was judicial immunity whihc was confirmed by the Appeal Court, who cited Fed Rule (12) (b) (6), after Petitioner had cited Federal Rule 57 Declaratory Judgment.

Petitioner pray that justice be done as stated by Congress and the

civil rights bill which was signed by President Bush which prohibits harrassment, forms of bias and discrimination and intentional discrimination based on sex, religion or disability.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe L. Robinson
5208 Whaley Drive
Dayton, Ohio 45427
513) 854-2789

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 17th day of December, 1991, three copies of the foregoing document were deposited in a United States mailbox, postage prepaid andserved upon;

D. Michael Crites
United States Attorney

Gregory G. Lockhart
Assistant U.S. Attorney
P.O. Box 280
200 West Second Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402
5130 225-2910

Joe L. Robinson

State of Ohio
County of Montgomery
Sworn to and subscribed before me this 17th day of December 1991.

28

Arletta Jo Rutledge

ARLETTA JO RUTLEDGE, Notary Public
In and for the State of Ohio
My Commission Expires Feb. 25, 1995

APPENDIX A

No. 91-3300

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

JOE L. ROBINSON,
Plaintiff-Appellant
vs.
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;
UNITED STATES CONGRESS,
Defendants-Appellees.

BEFORE: MARTIN & JONES, Circuit Judges,
& BROWN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Joe L. Robinson, a pro se Ohio resident, appeals the district court's order dismissing his action filed pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. ##2671-2680. This case has been referred to a panel of the court pursuant to Rule 9(a), Rules of the Sixth Circuit. Upon examination, the panel unanimously agrees that oral argument is not necessary. Fed. R. App. P. 34(a).

Seeking injunctive, declaratory, & monetary relief, Robinson sued the U.S. and the United States Congress based upon two unsuccessful legal actions which

he instituted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio. In 1984, Robinson sued his former employer for employment discrimination, & in 1986 he sued his union for discrimination and failure to represent him. Robinson now asserts that his constitutional rights were violated by the manner in which the district court handled his cases. As relief, Robinson sought: (1) an injunction directing the United States government and Congress to stop putting federal judges in office who are prejuciced against blacks and other minorities; (2) an injunction directing the government to pay his back wages, medical bills, insurance, and court costs; (3) the appointment of counsel to represent him, because he lost his previous cases due to the negligence of the district court

judges; (4) mailing of a copy of his complaint to every member of Congress at their expenxe; and (5) an order reopening his cases so they can be tried in Washington, D. C., where he can have a black jury. Subsquently, Robinson filed an amended complaint asking the court to declare that the actions of the district court judges while presiding over his previous trials were not judicial actions.

After de novo review of the Magistrate's report and recommendatior in light of Robinson's objections, the district court adopted the magistrate's report and recommendation and dismissed the case. The district court found: (1) that Robinson had failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6); (2) that Robinson had failed to serve the summons and complaint on any of the

named defendants within 120 days as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(j); (3) that the only person upon which Robinson had obtained service was a federal judge who was not a named defendant, and who was protected by absolute judicial immunity. Robinson has filed a timely appeal. Robinson requests the appointment of counsel and the preparation of a transcript at government expense in his appellate brief.

Upon de novo review, we conclude that the district court properly dismissed Robinson's action for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted pursuant to Fec. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). When Robinson's complaint is construed in the light most favorable to him and all of his factual allegations are accepted as true, he can prove no set of facts in support of his claims that would entitle him to relief.

See Meador v. Cabinet For Human Resources, 902 F .2d 474, 475 (6th Cir.), cert. denied, 111 S. Ct. 182 (1990).

Accordingly, the requests for counsel and for a transcript at government expense are denied, and the district court's judgment is hereby affirmed. Rule 9(b)(3), Rules of the Sixth Circuit.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT

Leonard Green
Clerk

By Neine Fields
Deputy Clerk

ISSUED AS MANDATE: October 18, 1991
COSTS: None

APPENDIX-B

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

Joe Robinson,
Plaintiff-Appellant

vs. C-1-90-0026

United States of America, et al,
Defendant.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court pursuant to reference to the United States Magistrate as a special master pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 636(b)(2), Rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and Section 1.5(1) of the Western Division Rule No. 1 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio. Pursuant to such reference the Magistrate reviewed the pleadings and filed with this Court findings of Fact and Recommendations for Disposition.

Subsquently, plaintiff filed objections to such Report and Recommendation.

The Court has reviewed the comprehensive findings of the magistrate and considered de novo all of the filings in this matter. Upon consideration of the foregoing the Court does determine that such Recommendation should be adopted.

Accordingly judgment is hereby entered as set forth specifically in such Report and Recommendation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Carl B. Rubin

Carl B. Rubin, Judge
United States District Court